**IRTP C
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 03 April 2012 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the IRTP C meeting on Tuesday 03 April 2012 at 1400 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-irtp-c-20120403-en.mp3
On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#apr
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:
Mike O'Connor - CBUC
Philip Corwin - CBUC
Simonetta Batteiger - RrSG
James Bladel -co-chair
Avri Doria - co-chair
Matt Serlin - RrSG
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Bob Mountain - Rr SG
Angie Graves – CBUC
Barbara Knight - RySG
Rob Golding – RrSG
Chris Chaplow – CBUC
Alain Berranger – NPOC
Hago Dafalla - NCSG

ICANN Staff:
Marika Konings
Glen de St Géry
Nathalie Peregrine

Apologies
Paul Diaz RrSg

Coordinator: Thank you. The recording has started. Please go ahead.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Sam). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This the IRTP-C call on the third of April, 2012. On the call today we have Michele Neylon, Hago Dafalla, James Bladel, Alain Berranger, Mikey O'Connor, Bob Mountain, Angie Graves, Matt Serlin and Philip Corwin. From staff we have Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Géry and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. We have an apology from Paul Diaz.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

James Bladel: Thank you and good morning, good afternoon everyone. Welcome to the IRTP-C working group call for the third of April, 2012.

I apologize I just took a drink of water and it went down the wrong tube.

So - excuse me. As you can see our agenda is there on the right hand side of your Adobe Connect screen. It was also circulated to the mailing list earlier today. Does anyone have any additions, comments or objections to the agenda as it's been proposed?

Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: This isn't an objection but Alain is unable to hear the room. I don't know - Nathalie, can you push the audio? Maybe Alain is trying to listen through the Adobe Connect room, not sure.

Marika Konings: Mikey, this is Marika. There is no audio in the Adobe Connect so Alain will need to dial in through the conference bridge.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. That's it.

James Bladel: Thank you, Mikey. And hopefully Alain can catch up with us here shortly.

No other concerns or comments about the agenda then the next housekeeping question is does anyone have any updates or changes to their statements of interest? Pause for 10 seconds there. And I'm seeing no hands in the room so we will continue. Thanks.

We have a few items to cove today and as you can see from the agenda we're starting to move outside of the brainstorming session for Issue A - Charter Question A, the change of control, although there's going to still be plenty of work to be done on that - on that topic. But I think that right now the sub team - especially Sub Team A will be doing a lot of the heavy lifting on that until they have a report back to the main working group.

So this group will take an update then from each of the sub teams. We'll start to take a look at the first draft of the initial report that Marika circulated on the mailing list this week.

And I would emphasize that we're reviewing that draft for structure and not content. At this point it is a very, very rough draft. We'll start to open up the discussions and deliberations on Item B which I believe is the time limit on FOAs, forms of authorization. And then we'll confirm next steps and move on to our next meeting.

So kind of an aggressive work plan today. And we'll see if we need to add anything as we go along. But the first item of business is to review the - get a progress report from the sub teams. Since Simonetta is not on the call yet I'm wondering if Bob would - if we can pick on him a little bit and ask him to do an initial update and then perhaps Simonetta can join in the interim and if not maybe one of the other folks on that team can give an update. So, Bob, would you mind going first?

Bob Mountain: No I wouldn't mind at all. Thanks, James. This is Bob speaking. So at this point we do have a proposed final draft of the survey that Marika was kind

enough to put together and wrap up yesterday. I'll send that out no later than end of day today to the entire working group. I would like everyone's comments if at all possible by the end of this week - by Friday.

And also any contacts that you would like to include in the mailing list for this to go to. And, you know, with a, you know, with a reference to yourself just to encourage higher response rate.

So once we have that by the end of this week by Monday, April 9 I'm proposing we send this out to the broader list - all the survey recipients - to that list we'll be compiling. And then we'll set a deadline for responses on - by Monday, April 16. I was going to say the previous Friday and give everyone a week but since that's Friday the 13th perhaps we want to extend it until the following Monday.

So that's the current status and proposed timelines. I'd open it up at this point to any comments, suggestions, questions that the work group might have.

James Bladel: Okay Bob, thank you for the update. And I think it is wise to tack on that extra couple of days just because I think that the Easter holiday falls in there somewhere and I know that some countries have extended breaks.

Bob Mountain: Good point, yeah, that's true too.

James Bladel: So some of them I think that's a five-day holiday or three day weekend at minimum so. Okay anyone have any questions or comments for Bob? I see Marika's hand up. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I actually uploaded the survey in the Adobe Connect room so those that are interested can just already maybe scroll around and see a bit the structure of the survey. It's, you know, broken down into the two charter questions, B and C, and, you know, different sub questions related to that.

And I've also posted the link to the draft survey in Adobe Connect. And that was also included in the agenda. So if people are already wanting to have a look and, you know, Bob I think will send out another reminder at the end of this call, you know, as soon as you can send us your comments if you have any that would be much appreciated. So the sooner we can get this out as well to the broader community.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Marika, and thanks, Bob and sub team (unintelligible) sub team for tackling this. So I think that that - if there's no more questions or comments there would be - Friday is the cutoff for revisions or edits to this survey with the goal of sending it out on Monday. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Dumb question but maybe I missed it. How do we submit edits to this?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. You just send an email with your proposed changes because it's a Zoomerang survey so you can't directly edit the survey...

Michele Neylon: No, no, I know I can't - no just what I meant is just on the main IRTP-C mailing list is it?

Marika Konings: Yes that's fine or the - I don't know if you're on the sub team...

Michele Neylon: No I'm not that's why - that's why I was asking.

James Bladel: I think at this point...

Marika Konings: Yeah, then just send it to the IRTP mailing list.

James Bladel: Right, Michele, I think at this point it's - I think - and correct me if I'm wrong, Bob, but I think the sub team is presenting this back to the working group as a whole for comments so if you have a comment or a change just send that to the main mailing list.

Bob Mountain: Yeah, that's correct, James, yes.

James Bladel: Okay so Friday is the date for this for any last changes. And also as Bob
                  mentioned folks to submit any individuals they believe would benefit from
                  sharing their expertise or their experiences. So I see Simonetta has joined us
                  just in time. Good morning Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Good morning. Sorry for being late.

James Bladel: No problem. In fact you're just in time to give the sub team update for data -
                  I'm sorry, not data gathering, the ideal process sub team relative to the
                  change of control. And I know that we had a significant amount of progress
                  on that so go ahead and take it away.

Simonetta Batteiger: Okay so there's two things that we have done over the course of the past
                  week. First we set up a public mailing list to keep track of the conversations
                  the sub team is having while we're working on our piece of this process.

                  And then we had a call to speak about more (updates) principles that we
                  started discussing in Costa Rica. And we got down this list pretty far. I think
                  there's only a couple, maybe two or three items left that we haven't had a
                  chance to discuss yet to better define what these principles are and if there
                  was a discussion about one of these items to bring up the two versions that -
                  or two or three versions that we want to bring back into the larger group so
                  that you can give your input and that we potentially will ask for more input
                  from the registrars or someone else on if we cannot come to consensus
                  ourselves.

                  So we're almost done with this task. I think we will need another call that is
                  scheduled for tomorrow to get through the rest of these items. And as soon
                  as we're done with that we'll share it with the larger group.

And the second piece that we will start tackling tomorrow is to actually draft this initial version of a flow of process based on these principles that we can then also bring back in the larger group hopefully by next week. So this is how far we got so far. And if anyone else in the sub team would like to chime in and add something that I forgot to mention then please go ahead.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Simonetta. Anyone else from either the sub team or the general working group team have any questions or comments for Simonetta? Okay.

Welcome, Barbara. I see that Barbara Knight has joined the call.

Barbara Knight: Thank you. My apologies for being late. I wasn't aware of the time changes kind of putting a - I don't know, wrench into my tasker so my apologies.

James Bladel: No problem. No problem. So, Simonetta, just for clarification so we have another sub team call tomorrow. And then we'll bring the principles back to this group for review during the next call a week from today on Tuesday. Is that your expectation?

Simonetta Batteiger: Yes, we can either do that or we can share them up front after the call with the mailing list so people have a chance to read them before we have our call next week.

James Bladel: That's a great idea. Do you think it's possible that we could have them on the mailing list like, you know, before the weekend starts perhaps or is that a little - pushing it a little too soon?

Simonetta Batteiger: We'll...

((Crosstalk))

Simonetta Batteiger: ...get to that point.

James Bladel: Okay. Okay thank you. So that's an update for the larger group from both of the sub teams. And I think that, you know, thanks to Bob and thanks to Simonetta and all the folks working on those that were on target for, you know, to be - getting the deliverables for those sub teams wrapped up and then we can take a look at how that's going to continue to support our findings and recommendations.

And speaking of findings and recommendations the next item on our list is to review a very, very early, you know, just being born sort of a draft of the initial report.

And if you recall the initial report is something that we wanted to if not have open or comment when we go to Prague we want to possibly at a minimum be ready to circulate this in Prague so that it can be open for comments immediately after the meeting so that when folks travel back home and get through their vacations and time off that they have a chance to take a look at this and if we can present that at our sessions there.

So once again we want to emphasize that we're taking a look at this section by section for structure and not of content. The content still needs to be filled in. There's still - are a number of items that are probably considered placeholders.

But I would ask at this point, Marika, if you would have a moment to perhaps just take five maybe seven minutes to walk us through the structure which I imagine is very similar to the templates that we use for other working groups. And if anyone has any questions or comments we'll just kind of let Marika go to the end and then we'll take them all at once, okay?

Marika Konings: Yeah that's fine. This is Marika. So you see the draft report on the screen. And it's also posted in the Adobe Connect - or on the wiki. I already got some comments from Angie that we'll incorporate in one of the next versions.

But just to take you indeed through the structure and especially highlight some of the areas that I've highlighted in yellow that will still need completion at the working group moves forward.

As James already said, you know, I think the structure overall looks - especially those that were involved in the previous IRTP working groups are very familiar also some of the content if you look at some of the background sections some of that has been, you know, basically lifted from some of the previous reports as, you know, the background to this PDP is similar to some of the previous ones.

So the first section is the executive summary. I just put in here some information already on the background that, you know, probably won't change much. But as those sections that, you know, still need further work open and this will be completed at basically at the end of the report once the rest of the content is done so we can fill in the blanks here.

Chapter 2 just talks about objective and next steps. One thing highlighted here that the working group will need to decide is once this report goes out for public comment how long the report will go out. I think the PDP requires a 30-day minimum but if the report gets published just before the Prague meeting the working group might want to consider extending that period to ensure that there's no conflict or - the time doesn't get too short as people traveling back and forth to the meeting itself.

Section 3 is very straightforward. That's really the process background and the issue background. Basically I've excerpted the relevant parts from the issue report to provide the context for those reading the report on, you know, what the issue is about and what information was provided to the working group at the start of the process.

Then that moves into the approach taken by the working group just providing an overview of who are the members. Once we've completed our meetings this will also indicate how many meetings everyone has attended, provide links to the statements of interest as well as the mailing list archives.

I think there's one note here Mikey probably needs to confirm when he exactly changed over from the Business Constituency to the ISP so we can make sure that we have a record of the date here as well.

And then Section 5 that's really where the meat of the report is going to be which is the deliberations of the working group and, you know, going into proposed or draft recommendations that are likely to be coming out of this work.

So looking there I'm actually noting that the numbering is off so that's something I'll need to fix. But the first section basically highlighting some of the initial fact finding and research pointing to the training session we did with James, the case studies that the working group developed to really, you know, make sure that people understand the kind of research that went into understanding the landscape and the issues the working group is looking at.

And then it basically dives into the different charter questions first of all looking at, you know, how is the function currently achieved. Basically there I've tried to capture the discussions we've had and the notes we've taken in the Adobe - or in the mind maps.

So again there if there's anything missing or any information incorrect, you know, feel free to submit your suggestions and comments.

Then the next section for this charter question goes into, you know, comparison with the country code name space and talking about the efforts the working group has undertaken to understand what is happening in the ccNSO landscape.

I've included for now the annex we developed, you know, comparing the different ccTLD models and some of the comments in the report as a - if there are further changes to that we can also change that. But again really to provide a bit of the background that, you know, the working group has used in coming eventually to its conclusions.

I think here you really see the first highlighted part where presumably at some point, you know, there will be some conclusions. Having looked at the comparison with the ccTLDs at which elements have been considered for inclusion in the change of control process for the gTLDs. So that's a section to be completed if the working group feels it wants to indeed highlight certain elements that it then has taken on board, you know, going further down and looking at the recommendations.

Another section here specifically called out in the charter question is a review of the locking procedures as described in Reasons for Denial Number 8 and 9. That's one of the areas we haven't really delved into. So again, you know, I've just spelled out what those denial reasons are.

But again here in highlighted, you know, the working group will need to develop its conclusions based on the review of those denial reasons in, you know, conjunction with any possible recommendations on the change of control procedure.

And then there's a section which is basically a placeholder that would outline the proposed change of control process. I'm assuming that, you know, a lot of that will come from the sub team that's currently working on this ideal process. And again, you know, this needs to be further developed and worked out.

And then there's the section where the actual recommendation would be written down where there's already a placeholder as well for indicating the

level of consensus that was achieved for the recommendation and also a reminder that the working group is also expected to discuss or highlight the expected impacts of the proposed recommendation.

A similar model is followed for the Charter Question B also outlining the current situation. Here there's a little bit of a placeholder as I'm expecting that some of the information on the current situation with regards to the use of FOAs will come back and as a result of the survey that Bob spoke about before.

Because for example one of the questions in that survey is asking registrars and, you know, other parties, you know, what practices they use at the moment. Are they limiting FOAs themselves? Are there no time limits being used? So maybe some of that information for this section will come from the survey.

Then again there's a section on data gathering where, you know, presumably more information will be added here once the survey has been completed. And presumably based on the results of the survey the working group will be in a position to, you know, develop certain recommendations.

I didn't write them out here. You know, my assessment is looking at the questions I guess there are there options. You know, there should be a time limit or no there shouldn't be a time limit. Or, you know, we don't have an opinion at this point in time. I guess there are just a couple of options there that could be explored here. And again level of consensus and expected impact.

Charter Question C goes into the same breakdown, you know, what is the current situation. There's one question there highlighted that I think that hopefully the Registry Stakeholder Group reps will be able to confirm whether it should be at least or only.

Then again it goes into the section on data gathering. And also the - further information is hopefully forthcoming as a result to the survey of the sub team that we discussed before. And based on that again hopefully there will be proposed recommendations that then will be filled in in the proposed recommendation section.

So then there's a next chapter that talks about community input so that's basically just an overview of the input the working group has received to date. One in response to the public comment forum that was held at the start of the working group; secondly as well as a result of the outreach that was done to the different SOs, ACs. And as a result of, you know, the outreach that was done to the stakeholder groups and constituencies and responses that were received as a result.

There's also a link here to the public comment review tool which has also been added I think in the annex to show what the working group has done with the comments and how those were addressed.

And then, you know, basically it's Section 7. Presumably there, you know, we might want to regroup together the different recommendations throughout the report to gather them back here but basically it's just to highlight that, you know, further - the refinement of this section will be done once the public comment period has closed and the working group has had time to review and assess the comments and make any changes deemed appropriate.

And then there are just a couple of annexes, the charter is there, the template that we've used to request input, the public comment review tool and then I already put a placeholder at the end to provide an overview of the results of the data gathering survey.

And I think that's in a nutshell the report to date.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika. Does anyone have any questions or comments for Marika on the structure of this report? I have a couple so I'll put myself at the end of the queue. But just wanted to give everyone else the opportunity to weigh in. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: Only one little comment in terms of the input we received it would be great if we could also include a summary of the input we got from the ccTLD meeting in Costa Rica and the other things that people have said in the room there. I would just like to include that.

James Bladel: Agreed. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Because that is actually in the annex because with all the input that we got from the ccTLD meeting I tried to incorporate that in the table that we discussed last week. And I think some people said that they wanted to add further information based on feedback they might get from, you know, from their respective (unintelligible) team.

So, you know, we can elect out certain parts there into the report but it's currently in the annex there is the detailed overview of each of the ccTLDs, you know, the main characteristics. And there's definitely still room as well for the working group there to review the different models and provide further comments on, you know, what they think will be helpful or not helpful from a gTLD perspective.

James Bladel: Okay thank you, Marika. Any other questions? I have two quick questions, Marika. And this is - one is more of a - it's not necessarily directed at staff but more at the group.

This structures seems to presume a couple of things that we really have not formally concluded in my opinion. One is that there is a consensus on this group for a proposal to offer a proposal for a change of control process.

I think that that is - seems to be the general sentiment of the work. Certainly we've kicked off a number of efforts in that area and that the case studies presented by the earlier sub team made a very compelling argument that the status quo is confusing and inconsistently applied.

But I don't want to just kind of feel like we were backed into that conclusion so I wanted to put out a couple of questions to the mailing group probably in the form - not of a survey but maybe just in the form of a Doodle poll to capture that we are indeed - agree that something is needed here. And what that something looks like I think ultimately we're still working on that. But I wanted to put that out to the group.

And then the second item was that that there was a section I believe it's - moved into Charter Question A regarding the Reason for Denial 8 and 9 and clarification of locking practices.

Marika, can you - it looks like I have scrolling control or maybe it's just on my screen. It looks like it's on Page 7 of the structured report. And that section I think may be lacking in our deliberations right now of Charter Question A.

So I think that we need to flag that when we have the ideal process change of control sub teams come back and present their process that maybe that's the time either for that sub team or a new sub team or this working group as a whole to address that question. But I think we might have missed that one unless someone can correct me and show me that we haven't.

Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. It is highlighted in the mind map but I think we indeed haven't really discussed it concretely yet. So it is noted there but I think we, you know, didn't get to that yet or maybe it's indeed something people are waiting for to discuss in light of whatever comes out of the sub team discussions.

James Bladel: Excellent. Thank you. Okay that was all I had for questions. I see Simonetta has a new hand so go ahead Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: Well on that particular one does that mean that we need to make space in our work plan for this? And if so where should this go? And...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Good question.

Simonetta Batteiger: ...is this something that the whole work group needs to make space on the entire work group's work plan or is this something that the work group feels the sub team should also be discussing? And then I would like to hear that from the group rather than just assuming that this is what we should also be working on.

James Bladel: Any thoughts on that - on Simonetta's question? Anyone? Very silent crowd today. Simonetta, I think that we should add it to that group. If we don't have a moment to do it into this first round that perhaps it can be done in parallel while the concept is presented to the entire working group. But I agree that it seems like it was overlooked. When I say overlooked I mean by me.

Okay any other thoughts here on this? I see Alain has posted something in the chat here.

Alain Berranger: Oh it's just a detail. It's just a typo.

James Bladel: Oh okay I see. Thank you.

Alain Berranger: Marika has noted it.

James Bladel: Okay.

Alain Berranger: There's a typo in the questionnaire.

James Bladel: Excellent, okay. Thank you. And I think that with this skeleton here we can start to put some flesh and bones onto this report. And it will start to take shape as we get closer to our publication date which would be at or before Prague.

So if there's no more comments on the draft report we can move on to Item Number 6 which is just a - starting to open the discussion on Charter Question B.

And, Marika, I don't know if we have some clean text somewhere of the question for Charter Question B so we can take a look at that in detail? But I think some of the first questions are relative to our approach. And perhaps we can also dust off one of my Mikey's approach mind maps if we have anything handy like that.

Am I the only one here?

Marika Konings: This is Marika...

Mikey O'Connor: I'm...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: I'm just looking at Charter Question B in the notes on the right and, Mikey, I've upgraded you as a presenter. I don't know if you have any - if it's helpful for you to bring up the mind map in relation to this issue.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, bear with me for just a couple of minutes. I wasn't ready. I'll be back.

James Bladel: Sorry to put you on the spot, Mikey. I'll buy us as much time as you need, how's that?

Mikey O'Connor: That's perfect.

James Bladel: So there's Charter Question B. And it states whether or not provisions on time limiting form of authorization, FOAs, should be implemented to avoid fraudulent transfers out. For example the gaining registrar sends and receives an FOA back from a transfer contact. But the name is locked. The registrar may hold the FOA pending an adjustment to the domain name status. During which time the registrant or other information may have changed.

I think that last phrase is interesting because it kind of doesn't really even talk about time limiting necessarily it just talks about, you know, what sort of a change in the Whois information cancels the FOA. That's one, you know, one interesting thing I think that's not necessarily part of the time limiting issue.

So while Mikey looks up his approach or his mind map here wanted to just take a queue on any questions or concerns that folks have about whether or not we should break down this particular charter question into component tasks.

And I think that while the data gathering sub team is definitely looking at some elements of this issue want to be sure that folks believe that we have a work plan in place to capture everything we need here.

So Mikey has got the work plan mind map or I'm sorry the approach mind map up. But I see that one person is in the queue so go ahead and go to Simonetta. Go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I just have a thought on this one recently that I know, for example, from the dotDE registry and I believe the dotBE registry copied the same thing.

They rant about this time limiting issue in some other form because there's really - there seemed to be two mechanisms how you can kind of provide a time limit in this transfer process. And one of them is the FOA itself where you can say okay the FOA is only valid for X amount of time.

But the other mechanism that is available for providing some kind of a time limit safeguard is auth code. And so what these registries have been doing is they didn't look at the FOA per se to time limit that but what they did is they issue auth codes basically on the fly while someone is attempting to do a transfer. And that auth code is only valid for a certain limit of time.

So they don't - they have built a safe guard in that way and it isn't the FOA piece that is time limited there it is how long they keep their auth code valid. So I just wanted to throw this out as it's another option to also think about this. And there's - and when we think about the security piece this is something else that we can also keep in mind as a tool.

James Bladel: Thanks, Simonetta. And I think that that's an interesting different way of looking at this issue. And I think it kind of substantiates the idea that it's the auth code that provides the security for a domain name transfer and not the FOA.

Which makes sense because one of those two things can actually block a transfer while another one is just after the fact, you know, it's more of an audit trail if I'm even stating that correctly.

But one thought on that was that gTLDs and perhaps we can look to Barbara and to our other friends from the registries on this is that the auth info codes in some cases registrars for gTLDs will set the auth info code once when the domain name is created and it will be unchanged.

So in our case it wouldn't be that the auth info code would be valid for a finite period of time it's a certain event or certain timeframes would trigger a reset

or generation of a new auth info code. But that's probably a technical discussion that we could probably have at the later time.

But I see Barbara is probably going to shed some light on this now. Go ahead, Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Hi, this is Barbara. So basically you're correct. So registrars can go ahead and set the auth info code when they create the domain name in the system. That is sent to the registry so that when we do receive a transfer request then we can validate against that.

I believe that the only time that they are modified - the registry does not modify them. So I believe that the only time that they would be modified is if a registrant, for instance, wanted to have their auth info code reset and then again of course the registrar would then pass it to the registry as well so that they would be in sync should a transfer request come through. Hopefully that's helpful.

James Bladel: It is I think. I'm not sure that registrars or at least all registrars consistently implement the service where a registrant can request a new auth info code or request their current auth info code be reset. But that's something interesting we should think about.

Simonetta, you wanted to follow up there?

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm wondering if we can - first of all is it - it seems to be the case that you're saying that a registrar generally has the ability to send an EPP call into the registry to say hey reset the auth code to something else. So whether or not this is triggered by a customer using a (unintelligible) interface or by just the registrar periodically, for example, when the Whois changes to also send a new command in to say hey change the auth code to something else at this point as well because maybe it's not the same registrant anymore.

I don't know, maybe - we can also think about some recommendations to give to registrars of when to update auth codes on domain names to provide more security for registrants.

James Bladel: I agree. Okay so now that's an interesting point. And I think something we definitely need to take into account as we discuss this issue is that where is the mechanism for control or for - the mechanism for implementing security in transfers. And I think that the practices from DE and BE indicate that it is really an emphasis on the auth info code as opposed to the FOA.

But that doesn't necessarily mean that the FOA is - that has no role to play here at all I think especially in the case where for example an FOA is held beyond the expiry date of the domain name or perhaps the FOA is, as we indicated in our Charter Question B, the registrant information changes between the time that the FOA is obtained versus the transfer. So these are things I think that are worth considering as well.

I see a queue opening up here. But I wanted to ask Simonetta if that is an old hand that just went down. Okay thank you. So, Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Hi, this is Barbara. Thank you, James. From our perspective as a registry operator and the first level dispute resolution provider we do look at the FOA to the extent a dispute is raised and submitted to us.

So from that perspective we're going to look to make sure that the information on that FOA and specifically the email address of the registrant or the admin contact is consistent with the Whois at the time that the transfer was initiated. So the timeliness of the FOA is pretty critical if a dispute were to arise.

James Bladel: Thank you. And have you ever reversed a transfer to your memory - reversed a transfer based on an FOA that didn't line up with, you know, either was too old or had stale registrant information or something like that? Can you think of a time where that posed a problem?

Barbara Knight: We have definitely reversed transfers in the instance where an FOA - the
                    data on the FOA is not consistent with the data that was in the Whois at the
                    time that the transfer occurred so, yes. And whether or not it was due
                    specifically to an old FOA, you know, I can't really say. But I do know that that
                    is, you know, a - I guess an authoritative record when evaluating a dispute
                    that and the Whois record at the time of the transfer.

James Bladel: Thank you, Barbara. Good information.

Barbara Knight: Yeah, and because we don't...

James Bladel: Simonetta, go ahead.

Barbara Knight: ...actually maintain the - I'm sorry if I can just add to it.

James Bladel: Yes, go ahead. Go ahead, please.

Barbara Knight: Because we don't maintain copies of the FOAs here at the registry those, you
                    know, go into the registrar and they're just asked to provide those to either
                    the other registrar under the transfer dispute policy or to the registry in the
                    case that a transfer dispute has come up, you know, we really are dependent
                    on looking at those.

                    And I don't know that there's necessarily a date that the FOA was created. I'd
                    have to go back and look at it. But I don't recall whether or not there's an
                    actual date to know specifically how stale the FOA data is.

James Bladel: All right thank you. Simonetta.

Simonetta Batteiger: I'm trying to understand - and I want to ask Barbara a few more questions
                    I guess. So it seems to me that the role the FOA plays in the dispute is that
                    you want to have some kind of a data point to say hey this person may have

given their consent to a transfer yes or no. And it's not - it isn't necessarily a - this person gave the consent at XYZ point in time.

But you want to make sure that the recipient of this FOA, aka the email address on it is consistent with the Whois records. And so basically to make a match between yes the registrant actually gave their consent versus no it looks like somebody else may have filled out this form.

And then if it is mismatched and you get a dispute this would be an indication for you to say hey this domain should actually probably be - or this transfer should probably be reverted. Which seems to me that it doesn't - I don't understand why it would need to be time limited for you to achieve that same thing. Maybe you can talk to this a little more.

I mean, I understand that maybe your line of reasoning would be to say okay if somebody gave their consent a year ago maybe they didn't mean it at this point anymore. But I would otherwise not understand why an FOA that was given six months ago would not provide the same data as the FOA that was issued yesterday.

And then to spin it a little further if it was time limited you could actually start gaming those too. You could say okay let me log in and change the Whois record first and then wait 10 days and then fill out an FOA. And now the FOA actually goes to someone who has the same email address as is on the Whois. And you would have a match and you would have lost that data point.

So I think - I'm not sure if the timing thing really provides more security versus this other idea that other registries have been using with like keeping auth codes time limited. Maybe you can talk to this one more. And if something comes to your mind why this would be more secure I'd like to hear why.

Barbara Knight: May I go ahead and address it?

James Bladel: Yes, Barbara, please.

Barbara Knight: Okay so from our perspective we don't look at the date. And I - in fact I'm just trying to get to the ICANN Website to the consensus policies where I can take a look at the FOA itself to see if there's a date on them.

Because at the registry we don't specifically look at the date of an FOA if it does exist we just simply look at the data on the FOA which is, you know, specifically whether or not the email address matches the information that's in the Whois again at the time of the - the time of the transfer request that comes to the registry. So from that perspective we're really not looking at it.

But the use case, if you will, or the instance where I could see where it could be an issue is if the FOA is older and so it's been out there for even, you know, two months and the registrar perhaps, I don't know, the domain name is locked and so it takes a while to perhaps unlock the domain name for whatever reason even though we know that it should be unlocked timely.

And in the mean time the registrant details may have changed. So in the instance where a dispute would arise, you know, the FOA that we have has one email address and registrant data. And then at the time of the transfer actually being initiated has another.

If a dispute were to arise we would go ahead based on the fact that there's a mismatch between the two we would basically rule in favor of the filing registrar saying that the domain name should go back.

So from that perspective you're going to have an inconsistency. It could very well be that the, you know, in the mean time the registrar - or excuse me the registrant that had originally completed the FOA and had that - and sent through the transfer command through their - what they wanted to be their new registrar maybe has sold their name on a secondary market or what have you and the new registrant details would be correct.

But unfortunately that information is not being supported by the FOA that is being provided in the case of a transfer dispute. Does that make sense?

Simonetta Batteiger: Can I respond to that?

James Bladel: Simonetta go ahead. Yeah, yeah, please.

Simonetta Batteiger: It does make sense but it seems to almost point to the fact that in the use case that you just described that FOA would - should have been invalid because a change in the Whois has happened. And we actually have a new registrant so the other registrant's FOA should no longer be valid.

So one thing that I take from what you just described is that one recommendation could be to say that the moment a registrant changes over and you have an FOA on file you should go ahead and actually ask for a new one because it is no longer valid.

However if nothing changes I don't see why keeping an FOA on file for a long period of time wouldn't actually start making things more secure because you have something on file that says okay - you have a Whois record and you have a matching FOA.

And if something goes wrong and a transfer happens without a new FOA being there then you have this ability to say hey there wasn't a match and therefore it is a data point to say it should actually be reverted back to the other registrant because they didn't authorize it.

So I'm not even sure if that's (shortening) thing or even the recommendation to always update it is really providing more security in those two cases.

James Bladel: Okay thanks, Simonetta and Barbara for some of that information. I am following that as much as possible and I think it's useful. And I put myself in

the queue just to comment. From a registrar perspective I think that there's an important concept here which is that the security lynchpin of all the security with domain names should be the auth info code and whatever registrar services - registrar locking service there are available.

But the FOA is an important component of the transfer. And I think that it's - I'm thinking of, you know, potential gaming or even some shady practices that could arise in either case.

For example in - if it's determined that FOAs are valid indefinitely and that's something that we kind of emphasized as part of this working group then it's not too difficult to see, for example, a shady registrar obtaining an FOA for a transfer the moment the domain name is transferred in or created and then just keeping that on file just in case which might sort of get away from the intentions of what the FOA is meant to achieve.

I think another question that I had was relative to - there's a section in the consensus policy that says something to the effect of providing auth info codes - and it says something to the effect of if the registry and the registrar use EPP as their provisioning system.

So my takeaway on that was - does that mean that the use of EPP and auth info codes is optional? And if so does that mean that we can make recommendations specific to the auth info codes that will apply universally to all registrars and all registries?

And I don't know that that's - I mean, I know that that's kind of how the world works and that's how everyone has implemented their registries. But I don't know that it's - that it's required in the policy. So that's just something to put out there and think about.

But I see that I have a couple more commenters here. So it looks like we'll go with Barbara, Simonetta, Michele and then we'll probably saw it off there and wrap up the call. So go ahead, Barbara.

Barbara Knight: Thank you, James. This is Barbara. I think the reason it was written that was is up until a few years ago VeriSign and perhaps other registries had not yet converted to EPP.

So once you are an EPP registry then the expectation is that you would have - and the requirement would be that you would have auth info codes that would be part of the transfer process.

So if, for instance, a registrar would send a transfer command to the registry without an auth info code then that transfer command is going to fail. And the registry would return an error message.

The same is true is if a - if an auth info code is sent to the registry that's not consistent with the one that's in the registry system. So if the auth info code is changed at the registrar level that is not passed to the registry at the time that it's changed then if the old - or if the new auth info code were passed with a transfer command that did not match what was in the registry record then again an error message would be sent back.

But I think, you know, what you're seeing in the way that's worded is just from an historical perspective that not all registries were EPP; there were still some that - operating with the RRP protocol.

James Bladel: Okay so it's just an artifact of previous policies then.

Barbara Knight: Exactly. But, I mean, you know, it is safe to say that any registry that is currently operating with EPP they're going to require an auth info code with the transfer command. And if it doesn't - if it doesn't exist or if it doesn't match that transfer request will fail.

James Bladel: Got it, thank you for clarifying.

Barbara Knight: You're welcome.

James Bladel: Did you have something, Barbara or just to respond to my question?

Barbara Knight: No that was actually it so it was kind of good that you asked that question because it was consistent with what I wanted to chat about anyway.

James Bladel: Okay, okay thank you. Simonetta, go ahead.

Simonetta Batteiger: I have a question first and that is when we're thinking about the new gTLDs does anyone know whether or not they have a requirement to be using EPP and auth codes? And if so could - if this is a requirement for these and we're talking about gTLD policy here is there a non-gTLD that at this point is not using EPP and auth codes and/or could we then just recommend that this could be a mechanism to provide more safeguards is one idea or thought.

And the other idea and thought I had on this whole discussion right now is again the simple versus complicated thought that came up at the ccTLD meeting. And also I'm thinking about what we did with IRTP Part B where we created a mechanism for people to actually escalate and say hey my domain got hijacked and here's what you need to look at.

Because I think regardless of whichever system we're recommending here to be put in place as a safe way to do business there's always going to be people that are finding some way to game it. And should what we're creating here make it more complicated for absolutely everyone else and the feedback that we got from the room in Costa Rica was now go with the simple fact.

We didn't see increased levels in fraud or other activity but we saw significant increases in satisfaction of the customers that work with us, aka, the registrars and everyone else.

And I think it was Leslie from the dotCO dotUK registry that said I hope that you will design something that will be easy to use for the users. So that's another thing that comes to my mind when I look at this whole discussion. We should keep in mind ease of use for the registrants who aren't professionals in this field.

And thinking back to our original use cases anything that we recommend should be something that's easy to do for them because if it's not then we kind of failed that mission not make it a standard and easy and nice process to use for these guys.

James Bladel: Thank you, Simonetta. And I agree. Go ahead, Michele, you're the last speaker for today.

Michele Neylon: Oh dear. Hold on a second I have to come back with something intelligent which I can't really manage. No a couple things, the reference to EPP Barbara covered that, I mean, it confirms what I suspected that the language predates the technology in some respects.

And Simonetta, there's a lot of ccTLDs that aren't using EPP. A lot. I mean, there's - the number that aren't using some form of automated API type system is reducing all the time. But there's a very large number of them not using EPP. Choose dotIE as an example if you want. They have an API but it's not EPP. But I would be very, very wary of encouraging anybody to implement transfer polices or change of holder processes based on some of these smaller ccTLDs. Thanks.

James Bladel: Thank you, Michele. And with that comment we'll kind of wrap up our discussion on this for today. I have some action items that I wanted to go over here in the last few minutes of the call.

First up please comment on the data gathering sub team survey which will be posted to the list. Comments for that end Friday and the survey will be posted Monday.

The idea process team is meeting tomorrow and will present back to this group next week so we'll make sure we get that on the agenda for our call on the 10th.

And I need to send out just a kind of a real lightweight poll just to test some of our consensuses that we've concluded to date - or some of our findings to date and whether or not we're still standing on solid ground with some of these areas.

So with that I would thank everyone for their time. Our next call is this time next week, same time, same channel. And thanks for - thanks for giving us your time today.

Barbara Knight: Thanks, James.

Bob Mountain: Thank you, James.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you, (Sam), you may now stop the recordings.

Coordinator: Thank you.

END